

THE OLD TESTAMENT ITS OWN DEFENCE

BEING A REPLY TO

"THE OLD TESTAMENT VINDICATED."

BY

JOSEPH S. COOK, B.D., PH.D.

INTRODUCTION BY REV. PRINCIPAL SHAW, LL.D.,

Of the Wesleyan Theological College, Montreal.

TORONTO
WILLIAM BRIGGS

WESLEY BUILDINGS

MONTREAL: C. W. COATES

HALIFAX: S. F. HUESTIS

1898

67
BOOK

1941

Entered according to Act of the Parliament of Canada, in the year one thousand eight hundred and ninety-eight, by WILLIAM BRIGGS, at the Department of Agriculture.

PREFACE.

THESE pages do not profess to answer every question raised by Dr. Workman in his "Old Testament Vindicated." The method used by the author as a scheme for settling Biblical difficulties, I believe, is sure to fail. It savors too much of Rationalism, and is too closely akin to the dangerous theories of criticism that make God's book very much like any other book—a mere human production.

Bishop C. H. Fowler, of the Methodist Episcopal Church, says: "In the chilling fog of Higher Criticism, which is higher only in name and assumption, all the warmth and winsomeness of Christianity are destroyed."

J. S. C.

WALKERVILLE, March, 1898.

INTRODUCTION.

WHEN Dr. Hurst, twenty years ago, wrote his very interesting "History of Rationalism," it was generally felt that he was tracing the operations of a recognized foe. To-day Rationalism comes with an evangelical spirit as devout as Semler's, but with a plausibility which tends to a paralysis of all faith in the supernatural. For a popular and very recent illustration of this we have only to read Washington Gladden's work just from the press, "Seven Puzzling Books of the Bible," a work made attractive by its style and by the author's activity in sociological problems. This process is not as marked in Methodism as in other forms of Christianity, because of intellectual stagnation, say our enemies,—I venture to say, because of the indisputable triumphs we have witnessed through simple faith in the two-fold Divine Word, written and incarnate. If I wish to deal fairly with these two greatest and most potent miracles of the ages, the Incarnate God and the Written Word, I must at the outset recognize the supernatural in all the subordinate miracles historically attested in the various dispensations. I must do this or be a Deist. I see no neutral zone between Christianity and Deism as a logical standing place. Borrowing, shall I say stealing, the ethical sublimity of the Divine Christ,

and glorifying Deism therewith, does not harmonize the two systems. The transcendent ethical contributions of Christianity will, in due time, disappear, if their supernatural source be rejected.

I know how to distinguish between men and their views. I do not ignore the Christian spirit of the author whom Dr. Cook opposes, nor do I accept all of Dr. Cook's statements; but this work is timely and able, and worthy of a place among the conservative apologetics of our day.

The supernatural in the Old Testament is ruthlessly assailed, from the Plagues of Egypt to Daniel's Fiery Furnace. More delicacy is shown for the New, as a consciousness is felt of the strange Presence there who could call forth more than twelve legions of angels for His defence; and if we harbor a hostile intention, like the Roman soldiers before this Presence, we go backward and fall to the ground. But how long will this reserve continue? Judging from the history of Rationalism, if this tendency prevail, we will at last have left a volume of legends with a slight basis of fact, and "Jesus in the midst" of the legends an actual personality, but mostly a creation of mythical exaggeration. "If thus the foundations be destroyed, what can the righteous do?"

WILLIAM I. SHAW.

WESLEYAN THEOLOGICAL COLLEGE,
MONTREAL.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
CHAPTER I.	
PRELIMINARIES - - - - -	9
CHAPTER II.	
PROPHECY - - - - -	18
CHAPTER III.	
MIRACLES - - - - -	26
CHAPTER IV.	
IMMORTALITY - - - - -	29
CHAPTER V.	
RELIGION - - - - -	33
CHAPTER VI.	
MORALITY - - - - -	40
CHAPTER VII.	
ANTHROPOMORPHISM - - - - -	45
CHAPTER VIII.	
INSPIRATION - - - - -	48
CHAPTER IX.	
CITATION - - - - -	61
CHAPTER X.	
EVOLUTION - - - - -	65



THE OLD TESTAMENT ITS OWN DEFENCE.

CHAPTER I.

PRELIMINARIES.

WE believe that one may, with perfect safety and reason, still hold to the traditional view of the origin and structure of the Old Testament Scriptures.

The time has not yet come for disregarding the "old-fashioned way of viewing and treating its literature." No doubt, as time goes on, new ideas will find a place in the mind of any earnest student, which, while tending to the modification of certain views, by no means interfere with the traditional belief that the Scriptures are just what they claim to be, viz., the Word of God, emanating from those who spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.

Dr. Workman may smile at an attempt to answer him from such a standpoint. This, however, we believe still to be the general position of Christians throughout the world. As yet no valid reason has been given why the belief of nineteen centuries should change, notwithstanding the fact that a few "Christian scholars" maintain a different opinion.

Andrew Jukes expresses the position of this essay when he says: "The mystery of the incarnation, I am assured, is the key, and the only sufficient one, to the mystery of the written Word. . . . Jesus of Nazareth is the Son of God; not partly man and partly God, but true man, born of woman, yet with all the fulness of the Godhead bodily. So, exactly, is Holy Scripture the Word of God; not half human and half divine, but thoroughly human, yet, no less, thoroughly divine. . . . And just as He, the Incarnate Word, was born of woman by the power of God's Spirit, so exactly has the written Word come out of the human heart, not by the operation of human understanding, but by the power of the Spirit directly acting upon the human heart."

"This Plenary verbal theory," says Dr. Cave, Principal of Hackney College, a well-known writer on the subject of Inspiration, "is accepted by Bishops Harold Browne, Hannah and Westcott; Deans Alford, Garbett and Goulburn; and Professors Bannerman, Eleazar Lord, Watts, Manley and McCraig—all of whom have written notable books on the subject." Old-fashioned the theory may be, yet the same high authority says, "This theory and the theory of degrees of inspiration are the only ones which really hold the field."

We have not attempted an answer to the whole book—for in it there are many valuable things which are helpful to all—but only to such portions as we deemed were out of harmony with the teachings of God's Word. There may be other objectionable teachings which we have not noted.

We are well aware that there are many others who could have given a more formidable reply to the book than we are able to give; but, so far, none has been forthcoming, notwithstanding the fact that the book has been openly questioned in a public conference of ministers and laymen, and severely questioned by very many in private conversation. Its endorsation by the honored Chancellor of

Victoria University may be taken by many to be the endorsement of the Methodist Church at large.

This, of course, is by no means the case so far as our Church is concerned, as our people generally are inclined to hold fast that which is good. We further believe that a reaction has set in against radical higher criticism, or, in other words, against Higher Criticism, as that term is generally understood ; or, as Dr. A. J. F. Behrend says, the time is coming, and it may be nearer than we think, when the literary problems of the Old Testament "will cease to command attention, because it will be universally acknowledged that tradition speaks with authority." The portion in quotation marks is from Professor Adolf Harnack's "The Chronology of the Old Christian Literature." "Harnack," he says, "has held chairs in Leipzig, Giessen and Marburg, and is at present the great shining light in Berlin. His influence in the leading universities of England and America is great. His latest and ripest contribution is all the more remarkable, because even in Germany his orthodoxy has been fiercely assailed." This we are glad to have to record, as it has become customary in some quarters to regard the universities of Germany as the real lights of the world. But other universities are thinking upon these things, and have not yet spoken their last word.

So far as the "Old Testament Vindicated" itself is concerned, it is a cleverly written book, showing a good deal of ability and aptness in putting the case before the public. The writer is evidently quite familiar with the various phases of current thought from the standpoint of the so-called "Higher Critic." The book, however, in our humble opinion fails to do what it was evidently meant to do, "to establish truth and strengthen the foundations of Christianity." We are inclined to the opinion expressed by Dr. Shaw, of the Wesleyan Theological College, Montreal, who says, in the July number of the *Methodist Magazine*, "His work is virtually an eirenicon. Eirenica, however,

though devout and amiable, are not always successful—they do not always escape the difficulties they try to obviate." He also says, "By many it will be condemned as simply inviting the reader from the perilous edge of the precipice of Goldwin Smith's rationalism to a doubtful refuge only a little way removed."

This, we believe, fairly states the case, so far as the very large majority of the Christian public are concerned, both in and out of the pulpits and universities of this continent; and, we may add, to the ordinary intelligent reader, such as we find among the members of our Church, Dr. Workman's book would be regarded as very dangerous to the Christian faith. Dr. Workman, I am sure, would not like to preach as he has written, to an ordinary congregation. The very fact that the book is welcomed by those who see very little of the supernatural in the Bible is, to our mind, very suggestive.

The book, of course, purports to be an answer to Dr. Goldwin Smith; but it is an answer that does not answer. Dr. Smith himself does not feel alarmed, for, while he may not see the same "millstone" that he hung about the Old Testament's neck, as he peruses the pages of his critic, he sees enough to convince him that there are others who take very much the same view of the matter that he does, Dr. Workman not excepted. He (Dr. Smith) virtually accepts Dr. Workman's position, and seems quite satisfied with the "vindication," as he sees very little difference in the situation, only in the fact that, instead of there being one rationalistic millstone, there are enough of Higher Critic millstones which, to his mind, amount to the same thing; and, to our mind, the stones have all come from the same rationalistic quarry. Dr. Smith therefore, satisfied that Dr. Workman and he really mean the same thing, stated this fact through the public press. To which Dr. Workman replied: "I am much surprised, however, that the only difference that Dr. Smith can discern between him and me is that I see fit, as he expresses it, to apply the

phraseology of inspiration and revelation to unhistorical history, to cosmogony contradicted by science, and to undefensible morality." Such surprise, however, does not take away the fact that Dr. Goldwin Smith states that little difference exists between him and Dr. Workman, and stakes his reputation as a critic by allowing this fact to be publicly known.

Another critic expresses an opinion, which also finds its way into the press. This time it is the Rev. Oscar B. Hawes, of Jarvis Street Unitarian Church. "Dr. Workman's book," he says, "was the culmination of a process going on in the orthodox Church, and which enabled a man to write a book to-day that thirty years ago he would have been excommunicated for. Dr. Workman to-day was fully on a plane with the Unitarianism of thirty years ago." If it be any comfort for Dr. Workman to find himself endorsed on the one hand by the rationalism of Dr. Smith, and on the other hand by the Unitarianism of the Rev. Oscar B. Hawes, we are sorry, in this instance, that we cannot "rejoice with those that do rejoice."

Dr. Goldwin Smith professes to believe in Christianity, yet how many are there who would retain their faith if our pulpits were supplied by men who would preach as *he* writes? We are not afraid of criticism, nor of the most thorough scholarly research, nor the testimony of the monuments. The Bible has nothing to fear from either history or discovery. It invites, yea, it challenges, investigation. At the same time, it may be wounded in the house of its friends. The Christian scholar, by going too far and making such large concessions, may prove too much, and those whom he may try to influence and conciliate may, in turn, use the same methods, but to a different purpose.

Among some of the peculiarities of the work we have noted the following, which seem, to say the least, scarcely warranted. This is what the writer says of it himself:

"Though a comparatively small book, it is very compactly written, and contains a pretty large amount of matter." (Preface, page 5.)

"So far as I know, it is the first attempt yet made to give a complete answer to such objections from the standpoint of modern Christian criticism." (P. 5.)

But, as Dr. Shaw says, "May we not consider that the same practical purpose animated Robertson Smith, Driver and Briggs?"

This same dogmatic spirit pervades the whole work, as the sweeping and uncalled-for use he makes of certain terms pertaining to scholarship proves. Indeed, after reading the work, one is inclined to use the words of Job in regard to Dr. Workman and those of his school: "No doubt ye are the people, and wisdom shall die with you." According to Dr. Workman, "the account of the Fall" is now explained by *Christian scholars* (the italics are ours) as religious allegory.

"*Christian scholars* claim for the inspired writers of Scripture only what such writers claim for themselves, namely, that they were prompted by the Holy Spirit to make an honest use of the best knowledge they possessed for the purpose of teaching religious truth." (P. 38.)

"The time has long come since the soundest *Christian teachers* taught that the Old Testament is not a revelation, but the record of a revelation." (P. 40.)

Christian teachers separate the acts of Joshua and Jehu from the teachings of Jesus (p. 52); *respectable scholarship* does not turn the Hebrew literature into a sort of cryptogram of Christianity; *reputable scholars* regard the Song of Songs as a lyric poem.

Intelligent interpreters have long since turned the Song of Songs into a cryptogrammic description of the union of Christ with His Church. No *competent expositor* will spiritualize Scripture for the sake of obtaining a Christian meaning. (P. 56.) The sense of the author rather than direct quotation is given here.

"*Modern teachers* . . . do not put all the books of the Bible on the same level." (P. 54.)

"*Christian scholars* . . . see other indications that the Book of Jonah is not strictly historical." (P. 61.)

"*Our forefathers* thought that the first part of Genesis was the oldest piece of literature in existence."* (P. 67.)

"*Christian scholars* have recognized for a long time that the ethnological statements of the Book of Genesis are imperfect." (P. 67.)

"*Evangelical scholars* have long recognized, too, that the Flood and the Tower of Babel . . . contain traditional elements which are peculiar to all such ancient accounts." (P. 68.)

"*Every competent scholar* would make a similar admission." (P. 70.)

"*All Old Testament students* know that the Books of Chronicles . . . were written at a comparatively late date, and from a distinctively religious and Levitical point of view." (P. 71.)

"*Evangelical interpreters*, like Delitzsch and Dillmann, frankly admit that the narratives of the patriarchs belong rather to the realm of tradition than to the sphere of rigid history." (P. 74.)

"*Theologians* now recognize that some features of the story (of creation) are not to be treated literally, but tropically." (P. 81.)

"*They (Christian scholars)* feel under no obligation to harmonize an ancient popular description (of creation) with a modern systematized account." (P. 82.)

"*Judicious teachers* do not maintain that the narrative in the first chapter of the book (Genesis) is perfect geology." (P. 83.) "Much less does any *wise apologist* try to reconcile the facts of science with the doctrines of Scripture." (P. 86.) See also a similar use of like terms, pages 6, 8, 19, 20, 29, 30, 31, 36, 42, 43, 45, 53, 54, 55, 57, 59, 69, 81, 85, 86, 101, 102, 119.

While these are not all, yet they are sufficient to show the style of Dr. Workman throughout his book. After looking over statements like the above (most of which are

* Dr. Cunningham Geikie then must be one of "*Our forefathers*," for he says, "As a whole, Genesis stands at the head of the literature of the world—the very oldest book now in existence."

direct quotations, while others simply give the meaning in connection with the term used), one cannot help coming to the conclusion that the "Christian scholar," in the estimate of the writer, is any one who agrees with the rationalistic method pursued, for, we confess, we have no better term than "rationalistic" to describe the method. It would, moreover, appear that all who do not agree with the above method, or do not arrive at the same conclusions, are possibly "Christian," but by no means "scholars." They would be better classed with our "forefathers," who knew nothing of these things. We, however, differ entirely from Dr. Workman when he assumes to tell us who the Christian scholars are, by inference, if not by name. Nor will we accept his standard of a "Christian scholar" any more than his method of interpretation. Christian scholarship, we believe, is tremendously strong against such assumptions as are made by Dr. Workman, and the concessions made to rationalism and infidelity. We challenge a denial of the fact that the *Christian* scholarship of England and America is preponderately against the Christian scholarship defined by Dr. Workman. The following list of Christian scholars, to be supplemented as we proceed (see pages 23, 24), who are conservative critics, will possibly be sufficient to show that there are some scholars left that are not ashamed, after a most thorough and impartial view of the whole situation, to declare their adherence to the more rational, and decidedly more scriptural, methods of the conservative critics. The list is copied from Dr. A. J. F. Behrends' "Old Testament Under Fire." An equally large and influential list may be found in "Anti-Higher Criticism," edited by the Rev. L. W. Munhall, M.A.

This is what Dr. Behrends says, and I think he may be considered an authority: "The statement that scholarship is practically a unit for the radical criticism cannot be made good. It is not true of Europe, it is not true of America. The most prominent advocates of radical criticism among us are Harper, Briggs, Toy, Mitchell, Smith,

and Haupt. But these men are not the superiors in scholarship of Beecher, Osgood, Green, Mead, Curtiss, Denio and Bissell." . . . In another place he mentions Bleek, Ryssel, Schrader, Klostermann, Baudissen, Kay, Kleinert, Dillmann, Delitzsch, Strack, Hoffmann, Orelli, Oehler, Keil, Riehm, Buhl, Hommel, Böhl, Brendenkampf, Marti, Kittel, König, Zahn, Rupprecht and Hoedemaker as condemning the main positions of the school led by Kuenen and Wellhausen. Of those defending the conservative position in England and America, he names "Davidson, Pusey, Stanley, Duff, Geikie, Watson, Sime, Binnie, Watts, Cave, Ellicott, Leathes, Simon, Orr, Dods, Rainy, Robertson, French, Sayce, Cotterill, McClintock, Strong, Bissell, Vos, Mead, Dwinell, Trumbull, Bartlett, Curtiss, Ladd, Chambers, Green, Osgood, Stebbins, Gardiner, Schodde, Terry, Steinert, Denio, Zenos, Beattie, Morse, Warfield, and Willis J. Beecher.

Most Bible students will be able to recognize among the English and American scholars those whom they are acquainted with. Among the German writers many of these names are also familiar. A reference to their names and the position they hold is at least instructive as coming from a man who, during the last twelve years, has made the critical study of the Bible a specialty; himself a German scholar, and perfectly familiar with the Hebrew, of whom Dr. Theo. L. Cuyler says, in reference to the discussion of the claims of Higher Criticism by Dr. Lyman Abbott, on the one side, and Dr. Behrends on the other, "I do not hesitate to say that for a combination of logical power and thoroughly Biblical scholarship, no man in the Brooklyn pulpit equals Dr. A. J. F. Behrends, and if the Plymouth pastor were to meet him in debate before an impartial tribunal of eminent and erudite Biblical scholars, he would be utterly routed." When, therefore, a man with such a pronounced reputation is particular to notice the inordinate claims of Biblical Higher Critics for superior scholarship, we may be pardoned in reproducing that notice.

CHAPTER II.

PROPHECY.

"FROM the time of Isaiah, the son of Amoz, the canonical prophets put forth the conception of an ideal Coming One." (P. 131.)

"It was not the miraculous prediction of future events, but the inspired utterance of divine truth." (P. 135.) The writer thus virtually takes the promise of a Saviour out of the Old Testament Scriptures, at least up to the time of Isaiah. This is but another result of rationalistic criticism. I prefer, however, that Dr. Workman and every "Christian scholar" should be judged by the utterances of the Book itself, and will leave my readers to conclude between the rationalism of the writer, whose book we are considering in these pages, and the Scriptures themselves, which give to the world a promised Saviour parallel with the human race after the fall of man, "and for the space of something like a thousand years one prophet after another foretold of Him and His days," without any contradiction or change of hope. "The prophetic form of the coming Messiah, drawn by many pens during a thousand years, and the dispersion of the ancient people, predicted in both Testaments, were the prophecies of Omniscience. The fulfilment could not have been brought about by human devices, and certainly the predictions were before the event."

"From the first prediction, *It shall bruise thy head*, down to the last, *I come quickly*, it hath pleased God to predict the coming future" (Dr. W. B. Pope).

We would ask Dr. Workman what he would make of the following ancient prophecies, which are declared by the sacred writers to have been fulfilled, or if not stated to be distinctively fulfilled in so many words, they are at least applied to Jesus, which amounts to the same thing. As, for instance, the one referring to our Lord as the promised seed of Abraham (Gen. xxii. 18), and applied by Paul (Gal. iii. 8-16): "And the scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith, preached before the Gospel unto Abraham, saying, In thee shall all nations be blessed." Verse 16: "Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith not, And to seeds, as of many; but as of one, And to thy seed, *which is Christ.*" He is also expressly declared to be the prophet which Moses foretold (Deut. xviii. 15): "The Lord thy God will raise up unto thee a prophet from the midst of thee, of thy brethren, like unto me; unto him ye shall hearken." And that Moses meant Christ is proved by the quotation and application of Peter (Acts iii. 22, 23): "For Moses truly said unto the fathers, A prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto you of your brethren, like unto me; him shall ye hear in all things whatsoever he shall say unto you. And it shall come to pass that every soul which will not hear that prophet shall be destroyed from among the people."

George Steward, in his great work, "The Mediatorial Sovereignty," begins his chapter on "Mediatorial Sovereignty the Doctrine of Prophecy," thus:

"We now turn to the inquiry, how far the doctrine of mediatorial sovereignty is indicated and confirmed by the collective testimony of prophecy." On page 280 he quotes the 2nd, 8th, 16th, 22nd, 24th, 44th, 47th, 69th, 72nd, 89th, 96th, 102nd, 110th, 118th and 132nd as "Messianic Psalms." On page 284 he says the words found in Deuteronomy xviii. 17, must be understood of the same august Person.

Dr. F. L. Steinmeyer, at that time Professor of Theology

in Berlin, says, p. 195, in his work, entitled "The Passion and Resurrection of Our Lord Considered in the Light of Modern Criticism": "The apostles make it perfectly clear in what sense they saw that Scripture, 'Thou wilt not give Thy Holy One to see corruption' (Ps. xvi. 10) fulfilled in the Saviour. Peter does so in his Pentecostal address (Acts xi. 31 *seq.*), and Paul in his preaching at Antioch (Acts xiii. 35 *seq.*), by the explanation, 'He whom God raised again saw no corruption.'"

Dr. Storrs, in his "Divine Origin of Christianity," says, p. 23: "A general course of prophecy fulfilled—It seems no more to require a mind peculiarly devout to find this in the Bible, than it needs such a mind to see the blending stellar brightness of the Milky-way constellations. Even the cautious and critical De Wette not only held the Old Testament a great prophecy, a great type, of Him who was to come, but attributed to individuals distinct pre-sentiments by divine inspiration of events in the future." Dr. Workman is disposed to belittle the work of Dr. Keith. It "*is uncritical, of course.*" His work on prophecy was written from the standpoint of traditionalism, as Dr. Smith well knows, and was published before the scientific study of the Bible had fairly commenced." (P. 134.)

Notwithstanding the "uncritical" nature of the work of Dr. Keith, it is still being read, and as far as I know, still being published. In 1878 it had reached its *forty-first* edition, and was then brought out by Longmans, Green & Co., of London, England. To intimate that such a work is both unscientific and uncritical is to insult the intelligence that demanded the repetition of so many editions. It may be uncritical in the sense of some, but an author that visited the Orient and travelled extensively in Eastern lands for the purpose of accuracy, added to which was his profound scholarship, is supposed to have known something. He belonged to that class of scholars who studied the Word scientifically; he knew what he was doing, he had facts for his theory and reason for his hope. True, he wrote

some time ago, having brought out the first edition in 1859, and while a great deal has been done since then by scholarship and research, the question is not a question of the uncritical and unscientific style of Dr. Keith—terms that may be modified by any one that uses them—but whether the critical and scientific “modern scholars” of to-day can dispose of Dr. Keith’s argument; whether they have something more scientific, more common-sense, more easily appreciated by the reader and more helpful to the doubting mind. If they have nothing better to offer than their own divisions and differences, their “crazy-quilt” theories, “post-eventum” interpretation of prophecies, their wholesale allegorical evaporation of whole portions of historic narrative—if they have nothing better to offer than the best the Higher Critics of the radical school have given, then let us be critical and scientific, and hold fast that which is good, which scientific criticism will certainly approve of. When a work on “Prophecy,” by one of our “modern scholars,” runs forty-one editions, then we may possibly wake up a little more to their theories.

Dr. Keith, in the work referred to above, says: “From the commencement to the conclusion of the Scriptures of the Old Testament it (the coming of the Saviour) is predicted or prefigured. They represent the first act of divine justice, which was exercised on the primogenitors of the human race, as mingled with divine mercy. Before their exclusion from Paradise, a gleam of hope was seen to shine around them in the promise of a suffering, but triumphant Deliverer. To Abraham the same promise was conveyed in a more definite form. Jacob spoke distinctly of the coming of a Saviour. Moses prophesied . . . of another law-giver. . . . As the Old Testament does contain prophecies of a Saviour that was to appear in the world, the only question to be resolved is, whether all that it testifies of him be fulfilled in the person of Christ.”

Dr. Stanley Leathes, Professor of Hebrew in King’s

College, London, says: "Chapters xxvii. and xxviii. (of Deuteronomy) are so clearly prophetic that it is impossible to make their composition late enough to be otherwise. Chapter xviii. 15 is inexplicable within the limits of the Old Testament."

Here, then, a modern critical scholar and Dr. Keith agree.

Dr. Farrar, Dean of Canterbury, truly a modern scholar, said three years ago: "Let us first look at the Old Testament. It has, as you know, thirty-nine books; but our Lord arranges all the thirty-nine under three heads: the Law, the Prophets, and the Psalms. Of these thirty-nine books, there are five books of the Law, twelve of earlier and later history (which are counted with the Prophets), sixteen prophetic books, and six books which are in form poetic. Let us glance at the general idea of each of these great sections. Of the Pentateuch, or five books of Moses, Genesis is the book of beginnings. Its first nine chapters give the story of the Fall and of the Flood. They teach us from the very first the great inevitable laws of sin and of retribution. The rest of the books show us God's methods of leading men back to Himself, not by miracle, but by hope and by mercy and by the agency of their fellow-men. With the Fall was given that earliest promise of the Deliverer which runs through all the remaining books like a golden cord, and with the Flood the rainbow of promise begins to flush and fade. We see it in the first book of the Bible, shedding its yellow lustre on the ebbing waves of the deluge; we see it in the last book of the Bible—overarching the throne of mercy with its emerald span."

Dr. Alfred Edersheim wrote: "To say that Jesus is the Christ means that He is the Messiah promised and predicted in the Old Testament; while the views (Higher Criticism) referred to above respecting the history, legislation, institutions and prophecies of the Old Testament seem incompatible alike with Messianic predictions

in the Christian sense, and even with real belief in the divine authority of the larger portion of our Bible."

Dr. Dewart, in his able work on "Jesus the Messiah" (a book worthy of the careful perusal of every Bible student), after having shown from the first promise of a Saviour, in Genesis iii., the prophecies which predictively refer to Christ in a most exhaustive manner, says (p. 222): "As we have seen, the correspondence between the facts and the prophecies is conclusive evidence of fulfilment, in the ordinary Christian sense, apart from the numerous statements about certain prophecies being fulfilled. But the testimony of Christ and the apostles is another invincible body of evidence against the negative theory."

The Rev. C. A. Row, M.A., author of "Christian Evidences Viewed in Relation to Modern Thought," writes: "The Scriptures of the Old Testament consist of a very varied literature, legal, historical, poetical, prophetic, hortatory and didactic, the composition of which extended over a period of more than a thousand years, and the books of which it is composed are works of at least forty different authors; yet, notwithstanding this variety of authorship and dates, one Messianic conception pervades the whole."

To the above could be given many more extracts which, in the main, agree with Dr. Keith, whom Dr. Workman would belittle. But even in view of Dr. Workman's criticism, it appears that the most popular and well-known writers are yet so uncritical and so unscientific as to follow the same line of argument as that of Dr. Keith, namely, the argument of "correspondence and fulfilment."

To all of the above may be added the following names, whose works we have consulted on this subject, and whom we would scarcely like to class as either uncritical or unscientific, for they are certainly modern scholars:

Dr. Joseph Angus, author of "Angus' Bible Hand-Book"; Bishop Foster, of the M. E. Church; late Archdeacon Wilberforce, author of "The Incarnation"; Canon Girdlestone, M.A., author of "Foundations of the Bible"; Bishop

Westcott, the eminent classical scholar and translator ; Rev. J. A. McClymont, B.D., one of the editors of the present Guild Series of Bible Text-Books ; Dr. Alfred Cave ; late Philip Schaff, D.D. ; late Bishop Simpson, of the M. E. Church ; Dr. Watts, of Belfast ; Dr. A. J. F. Behrends, of Brooklyn, N.Y. ; Rev. Francis J. Sharr, Fernley Lecturer for 1891 ; A. T. Pierson, D.D., author of "Helps to Bible Study" ; Prof. Robertson, D.D., University of Glasgow ; Prof. William G. Moorehead, D.D., United Presbyterian Theological Seminary, Xenia, O. ; Prof. W. H. Green, D.D., LL.D., Princeton Theological Seminary ; Talbot W. Chambers, D.D., LL.D. ; Dr. Peloubet, author of the Select Notes on the International Lessons.

We might also add that among the many theological schools of this continent, very few indeed will be found to subscribe to the theory advanced by Dr. Workman. It is a theory of radical and not conservative criticism. No one need be afraid of what scholarship may do ; indeed, advancing scholarship is confirming the Biblical records more and more. Then the scholarship of any age is not that which is necessarily seen in print. Hence could be counted the thousands of pastors whose scholarship has kept them from running after the novel theories of rationalistic teachers—men with both learning and independence enough to look at the question from every point of view, and yet retaining the logically sound conclusions only of those who could make out a case. Unfortunately for the radical critics, they have failed even to disturb the surface of Christian humanity to any large extent. They have been met stroke for stroke, book for book, learned scholar for learned scholar, and all the while the great representatives of Christianity from their professors' chairs and pulpits, have been acting as jurors, and the verdict is overwhelmingly in favor of the conservative school of Biblical criticism.

"We will only have to wait a little while longer when the whole theory of radical criticism will be ruled out of court."

Already the ruling has begun ; divisions are quite frequent among the critics themselves, some are abashed, and under cover of the approaching night are making a hasty retreat, while the great conservative hosts are advancing and picking the Higher Critics off every rampart and fortress they have ever erected. Notice the positions of some of the great universities of to-day. "Among the most famous theological faculties in Germany are those of Berlin, Bonn, Breslau, Greifswald, Halle, Königsberg, Leipzig and Tübingen. In these universities are seventy-three theological professors, of which number thirty belong to the radical school, while forty-three belong to the moderate and conservative ranks." "During the last two years the conservatives have been rapidly gaining on the radicals, and the reaction against radicalism seems to be assuming formidable proportions among the general clergy and laity." "Radical criticism is represented in Boston, Yale, Harvard, Cornell, Johns Hopkins, Union, Chicago and Andover. But conservative criticism holds its ground in Bangor, Yale, Hartford, Princeton, Drew, Madison, Auburn, Rochester, Rutgers, Allegheny, Crozer, Lane, Louisville, Chicago, Evanston, Oberlin, Omaha and Oakland. Yale and Chicago occupy middle ground." ("The Old Testament Under Fire," pp. 99-101). The above references have been made at this juncture, because the theory of prophecy held by Dr. Workman is that which is generally held by the radical critics, and these references go to show that those holding the traditional belief regarding prophecy have by no means left the field. Or, as Canon Girdlestone very aptly puts it, "There are about a hundred predictions of Christ in the Old Testament, the oldest about 4000 B.C., and the latest 400 B.C." In this he is in full accord with another writer named above, Rev. J. A. McClymont, B.D., who, in referring to the Gospel of Matthew, says: "In the course of the Gospel there are no less than sixty citations of Old Testament prophecy as fulfilled in Jesus." These men are "modern scholars," and know whereof they affirm.

CHAPTER III.

MIRACLES.

IN this chapter our author discredits many of the miracles of the Old Testament.

1. "Such miracles as the Twelve Plagues are practically synonymous with divine interventions or providential interpositions."

2. "The account of the destruction of the Cities of the Plain is a graphic description of an ancient volcanic eruption."

3. "The subsequent turning of Lot's wife into a pillar of salt was likewise due to natural causes."

4. "The story of Balaam is a traditional account of an ancient angelic appearance, belonging to a time when the idea of animals talking with men was practically universal." (Pages 126 and 127.)

In reference to 1, there is no doubt they were "divine interventions" or "providential interpositions," as every miracle which the Bible records was; but here was a special intervention for a special purpose. It was known they would happen, and they came to pass according to the Word of the Lord which He had formerly announced to Moses. .

Moreover, these miracles were preceded by others, such as the "Burning bush not consumed" (Ex. iii. 3) and "Aaron's rod changed into a serpent" (Ex. vii. 10-12). They belong to the same category as the dividing of the Red Sea, the sweetening of Marah's water, the sending of the daily

manna, water from the rock, the turning of part of Israel for faithless discontent, Nadab and Abihu consumed for offering strange fire, the earth opening for Korah, Aaron's rod budding, the healing of the Israelites by looking at the brazen serpent. These miracles are just as trustworthy as any others. The narrative that contains them is historic, not symbolical; for if we, by critical evaporation, extract the literal here, what are we going to do with any other part of the Old Testament where miracles are recorded? No proper reason has ever been given why we should consider the Ten Plagues otherwise than miraculous in their character.

2. We will not deny that God could use the neighborhood of Sodom to destroy the city. He can do whatsoever He will. But in this case He rained down fire from heaven, or fire from the Lord out of heaven. There was not necessarily a volcanic eruption, or even if we were to admit there was, then the miracle would not in the least be affected, as only divine power can use a volcano for a special purpose and at a special time. The narrative, however, precludes the introduction of anything more than what is really stated. The narrative is further confirmed by the use Jesus made of it when He said: "The same day that Lot went out of Sodom it rained fire and brimstone from heaven, and destroyed them all." (Luke xviii. 29.) We need no further comment than that of Jesus to establish the historic reality of that occurrence. Not only was it a miracle, but a prophecy fulfilled, which fact alone destroys the theory of a mere natural state of things.

3. Here, too, Jesus confirms the Scripture when He said, "Remember Lot's wife."

4. "That this was a visionary scene is a notion which seems inadmissible, because of the improbability of a vision being described as an actual occurrence in the midst of a plain history." (Jamieson, Faussett and Brown.)

Moreover, on what authority is this made to be a mere traditional account, put there to reflect the ideas of the

age? As far as we have been able to ascertain, our critics have a most fertile source of imagination from which they draw whenever it seems to suit their purpose. Not that they do these things intentionally, but because "they fancy that everything must accord with their theories." But they are bound to disappointment, as not only are there divisions among themselves, but one by one they are getting back to sounder modes of criticism, which appear less ridiculous in the eyes of the reading public and more sensible from their own standpoint.

CHAPTER IV.

IMMORTALITY.*

THE conclusion that we arrived at, after reading this chapter, was that the Egyptians had a clearer idea of the immortality of the soul than the Israelites, that there is no definite teaching in the Old Testament regarding future rewards and punishments. In fact, our author is emboldened to say, "No distinction is drawn in the Hebrew Scriptures between the condition of the righteous and the condition of the wicked in the other world." (P. 145.)

The very meaning of the word "*Sheol*" is too hastily given. "The Hebrew *Sheol*, like the Greek Hades, represents, it is true, 'a shadowy abode of the dead.'" It means this, but a good deal more; otherwise many passages of Scripture are left unexplained.

Jacob said, "I go down into *Sheol* unto my son mourning." (Gen. xxxvii. 35.)

"Ye shall bring my grey hairs with sorrow to *Sheol*." (Gen. xlii. 38.)

In these passages the grave is evidently meant, and not the shadowy abode.

"The Lord killeth and maketh alive, he bringeth down to *Sheol*, and bringeth up." (1 Sam. ii. 6.) God certainly does not bring up from hell or the shadowy world, unless we are prepared to believe in the doctrine of conditional immortality.

* In this chapter we have used the argument of the late Moses Stuart, in a condensed form, contained in his work on "Future Punishment," pages 105-169.

"The snares of *Sheol* encompassed me ; the deadly nets came upon me."

"Thou shalt not let his hoary head go down to *Sheol* in peace."

"He that goeth down to *Sheol* shall come up no more."

"O that thou wouldst hide me in *Sheol*."

"If I wait, *Sheol* is my house."

"In death there is no remembrance of thee : in *Sheol* who shall give thee thanks ?"

After giving the above passages and many others, Moses Stuart, that eminent Hebrew scholar, makes the remark : "There can be no reasonable doubt that *Sheol* does most generally mean the *under world*, the grave or sepulchre, the world of the dead, in the Old Testament Scriptures."

If no distinction is drawn between the condition of the righteous and the wicked in the Old Testament Scriptures, what are we to make of such passages as have reference to life and death, with a plainly stated future meaning ? Take those that emphasize life :

"Ye shall keep my statutes, and my judgments ; which if a man do, he shall live in them." (Lev. xviii. 5.)

Also, Nehemiah ix. 29 ; Ezekiel xx. 11, 13, 21.

"Keep my commandments, and live." (Prov. iv. 4 ; vii. 2.)

"Hear and your soul shall live." (Isa. liii. 3.)

"If thou warn the righteous man, that the righteous sin not, and he doth not sin, he shall surely live ; he shall not die." (Ezek. iii. 21.) See also Ezek. xviii. 9, 17 ; xxxiii. 13, 15, 16, 19.

"Seek ye me, and ye shall live." (Amos iv. 5, 6.)

"Thou wilt show me the paths of life." (Psa. xvi. 11.)

"She is a tree of life to them that lay hold upon her." (Prov. iv. 22.)

"Keep thy heart with all diligence, for out of it are the issues of life." (Proverbs iv. 23.) See also Proverbs x. 11, 17 ; xi. 30 ; xii. 28 ; xiii. 12, 14 ; xiv. 27 ; xv. 4, xvi. 22 ; xviii. 21 ; xxi. 21 ; Ezekiel xxxiii. 15 ; Malachi ii. 5.

In the New Testament the instances are very numerous : John v. 40 ; vi. 33, 35, 48, 51, 53, 63 ; viii. 12 ; xi. 25 ; xiv. 6 ; xx. 31 ; Acts iii. 15 ; Romans v. 17, 18 ; viii. 2, 6, 10 ; 2 Corinthians ii. 16 ; iii. 6 ; iv. 10, 12 ; Galatians iii. 21 ; Philippians ii. 16 ; Colossians iii. 4 ; 2 Timothy i. 1, 10 ; James i. 12 ; 1 Peter iii. 7 ; 2 Peter i. 3 ; 1 John i. 1 ; v. 12, 16 ; Revelation ii. 7, 10 ; xxi. 6 ; xxii. 1, 14, 17.

Hence it is quite clear that both Old and New Testament writers deal with the subject of future reward very much the same way, in their employment of the word "life."

The corresponding words, "die" and "death," are also used, but to denote, not natural, but spiritual death, with a future meaning.

"The soul that sinneth shall die." (Ezek. xviii. 4 ; xx. 17.) "Have I any pleasure at all that the wicked should die?" (Ezek. v. 21.) (See also Ezek. v. 24, 26, 28.) "I have no pleasure in the death of him that dieth." (Ezek. v. 32.)

"He that hateth reproof shall die." (Prov. xv. 10.) "The wicked man shall die in his iniquity." (Ezek. xxxiii. 8.) "See, I have set before thee this day life and good, *death* and evil." (Deut. xxx. 15.) "I have set before you the way of life, and the way of death." (Jer. xxi. 8.) "I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked." (Ezek. xviii. 32.)

But *Sheol* has a secondary meaning, which our author failed to give ; and, when used, designates the "world of woe."

"They spend their days in wealth and in a moment go down to *Sheol*." (Job xxi. 13.) "The wicked shall be turned into *Sheol*, and all the nations that forget God." (Ps. xix. 18.) "Her feet go down to death, her steps take hold on *Sheol*." (Prov. v. 5.)

"But he knoweth not that the ghosts are there, and that her guests are in the depths of *Sheol*." (Prov. ix. 18.) (See also Num. xvi. 30, 33 ; Deut. xxxii. 22 ; 1 Kings ii. 6 ; Ps. xlix. 14, 15 ; Is. v. 14.) How can any one, examining

the above passages, come to any other conclusion, but that future rewards and punishments are clearly and distinctly taught, though by no means so clearly or so fully taught as in the New Testament, where "Life and immortality are brought to light by the Gospel."

With regard to the Egyptians having a more distinct idea than the Hebrews on the question of immortality, even granting the contention for the sake of argument, can we suppose Moses, "who was learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians," to have been ignorant of the doctrine? Nor is it supposable that the people among whom were prophets, priests and writers on religious subjects, should be more ignorant of so important a subject than their neighbors. The supposition is decidedly in favor of these nations having their ideas revived by coming in contact with the Hebrews whose views were much clearer than their own.

CHAPTER V.

RELIGION.

“RELIGION was a racial peculiarity of the Hebrews.” (P. 49.) “The religion of Israel started as a tribal monotheism, but it rose to an ethical monotheism, the germ of which goes back to very remote times.” (P. 87.)

By such statements our author will find hosts of sympathizers, both among Deists and Agnostics. This we regard as one of the most dangerous concessions of the whole book. Let us reason backward. The religion of Israel started as a tribal monotheism. But there was a God interested in His creature, man, even before Israel was a tribe. Man, then, was polytheistic, or, to use Dr. Workman's own words, there was “a gradual ascent from fetichism and polytheism to the worship of a single God;” but, before, he imagined he ought to worship *Something*, having as yet no idea of a *Some One*. What was man? Had he any god at all? According to the above he had not. There must have been a time in man's history when he was without God; but in the course of time he imagined he heard something or saw something—in his dreams possibly. Then he tried to make an image of what he imagined was either his greatest blessing or greatest curse. His ideas of the thing worshipped determined his actions. Then it happens that this something must have life. Around him are so many manifestations of life, in the heavens above and in the earth beneath and in the waters under the earth, that all are invested with a personality

that becomes real. Hence appear the numerous deities of the polytheist. But all this time there is a man with an immortal spirit, with a double responsibility upon him, to make his way in the world, and also to make a God that will suit him best. Time goes on, and the same man that had fought his way from very "remote times" through fetichism to polytheism, now resolves all in one, and at last becomes a monotheist—a "tribal monotheist." That is, the God of the Scriptures has been gradually evolved from a "germ," which goes back to the "remotest times." Revelation, therefore, was not necessary according to such a process; natural religion has been all-sufficient, and man's imagination and reason have done for him what revelation proposes to do. Then, if man could do so much toward revealing God, reaching up to the Deity through so many forms, he was perfectly capable of compiling and composing his own scriptures, sufficient for the times in which he lived; therefore, we must expect to find traces of that development in his writings.

To do so we must exclude the Bible, for we have no evidence of such a process as described above. We do see traces of such a development among the comparative religions. But inasmuch as we deny the assumptions contained in the above quotations, it is quite plain that our duty is to show that religion is a revelation of God, and therefore neither racial nor the result of a process of evolution.

In taking the ground that God is the same yesterday, to-day and forever, we also take the ground that He revealed Himself to man from the beginning, and was never left without a witness who could testify that he *knew God*, whom to know is life everlasting. That, parallel with this revelation of Himself, was there a "revealed religion," which was not a "racial peculiarity," but a universal fact, so far as the human race in its beginning was concerned. The opening words of Scripture, "In the

beginning God created the heavens and the earth," are proof of the fact that when Moses wrote, the people to whom he wrote were monotheists. From the very beginning of history, as far as Moses takes us back (and we still hold to the fact that he takes us farther back into the realms of veritable history than any one else), man was a worshiping being. He worshipped a God of power, righteousness and mercy, in fear, love and dependence. The first man, therefore, that we have any knowledge of, knew no god but the unchangeable God of the Scriptures. Whatever beliefs or forms of worship we find after that are the result rather of the degeneracy of man than that the forms of Animism and Polytheism were parts of the system that evolved the idea of the true God.

Moses and Isaiah had the same majestic conception of God. Compare Deut. vi. 4 with Is. xliv. 8. "Why should they not, since God revealed Himself to both." He did not reveal His *plans* to both alike, but He did *Himself*. The moral teaching in Leviticus xix. 18 can well be compared with Rom. xii. 19. (See also Prov. xxv. 21, 22, and Matt. v. 44.)

Some may be ready to call this an invidious comparison, for was it not said by them of old, "an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth"? Yes, the same thing exists to-day so far as the civil law is concerned. The reference here is to the civil rather than the moral law, a distinction which should always be kept in mind. But that a righteous God required a righteous life from the days of Adam to Jesus, according to opportunity, is, we believe, the true teaching of the Old Testament Scriptures. Let us take some of the most ancient of the Oriental nations to illustrate that humanity's conception of God in the beginning was monotheistic. We will begin with Egypt. "The fundamental doctrine was the unity of the Deity, but this unity was not represented; but the attributes of His being were represented under positive forms, and hence arose the multiplicity of gods that engendered idolatry." (Sir Gardner Wilkinson.)

Mr. Cooper, Honorary Secretary of the Society of Biblical Archaeology, says: "First of all, the Supreme Deity of the Egyptians was Ammon Ra, the spiritual author of all existence—physical, moral, and everything else."*

Dr. Sayce, in his chapter on "The Egyptian Religion," says: "The names of one god are at times very numerous; for example, in one inscription the Sun-god Rā is addressed under seventy-two different names, and a whole chapter of the 'Book of the Dead' is given up to the names of Osiris. In such lists we often find one god identified with another, and indeed with several others; so then it is evident that a large number of the minor deities are merely forms of the great gods, and the same statement applies even to the great gods themselves. For example, the god Rā, when he rose in the morning, was called Harmachis, at mid-day he was called Rā, in the evening he was called Atum or Tum. . . . The Egyptian called every god *nutar* (power); but, in addition to this, he seems to have had an idea of God which will bear some comparison in sublimity with our own." For example, let us take an extract from a hymn:

"God is One and Alone, and there is none other with Him. God is One, the One who has made all things. God is Spirit, the Spirit of Spirits, the Great Spirit of Egypt. The Divine Spirit God is from the beginning, and has existed from the beginning." To all of which J. A. S. Grant (Bey), of Cairo, Egypt, agreed, when he said at the Parliament of Religions: "In the ancient Egyptian religion, therefore, we have clearly depicted to us an unnamed almighty Deity, who is uncreated and self-existent."

CHINA.—Dr. Legge, the great authority on all things pertaining to China, says: "The Chinese fathers knew God as the Supreme Ruler, whose providence embraced all. Tien has much the force of the name Jehovah, as God Himself explained it to Moses. . . . Li was to the

* "Inspiration of Holy Scriptures." Rev. Francis J. Sharr.

Chinese fathers, I believe, exactly what God was to our fathers, whenever they took that great name upon their lips." Is it not true, also, that present-day Chinese philosophers go back to one whom they call the "Great Supreme," from whom emanated Yin-Yang, from whom the elements sprang, and by whom man was created?

India tells the same story as China and Egypt. Professor H. H. Wilson says: "There can be no doubt that the fundamental doctrine of the Vedas is monotheism. . . . M. Adolph Pietet, in his great work, '*Les Origines Européennes*,' gives it as his opinion that the religion of the undivided Aryans was a monotheism more or less defined, and both Pietet and Muller maintain that traces of the primitive monotheism are visible in the Veda, that the remembrance of a God, one and infinite, breaks through the mists of idolatrous phraseology, like the blue sky that is hidden by a passing cloud." "We conclude, therefore, that the knowledge of the divine functions and attributes possessed by the Vedic Aryans was neither the product of intuition, nor experience, but a survival of the result of a primitive revelation."* Persians, more especially ancient Persians, at present the representatives of the ancient national religion of Persia, are to be seen mostly in India, and go by the name of Parsees. They, however, are true followers of Zoroaster, and are called sometimes Zoroastrians. By going back to the beginning of this religion we find it monotheistic, and its expounders to day claim for it a belief in one God, known under different names.

The Rev. William Arthur, in his admirable volume, "God Without Religion," takes us back geographically to the ancient centres of civilization, and the farther back he goes proves the more conclusively the contrary of the evolution theory held by Dr. Workman.

Dr. Workman is perfectly consistent in his conclusion

* Rev. Maurice Phillips, of Madras.

regarding the development of God in the human mind, beginning, as he does, with the "germ" in the man, and it being a "germ so remote," it can scarcely be called by that name. But how unlike God to start man in such a way! How contrary even to the most natural way of thinking! As a rule, we do not in our childhood begin with the many and get back to one. It is rather the other way; we go from monosyllables to polysyllables. Therefore, instead of taking the ground that monotheism presupposes polytheism, we think it is more rational to suppose that the simpler belief should precede the more complex; or, as Max Muller says, "The more we go back, the more we examine the germs of any religion, the purer I believe we shall find the conceptions of the Deity."

Dr. Townsend, in his "Elements of Theology, says :

"Monotheism is that system of religion which treats of one God. This appears to have been the original faith of mankind. This is as we should expect, provided the Scripture representations are correct—that originally God created but one man, and disclosed to him the truth; that, later, the earth was swept of its inhabitants by the deluge of Noah; that but one family, and that one educated in a monotheistic faith, and impressed by the most startling providences which have appeared on earth, and which were believed to be under the direction of one personal God, went forth from the ark to re-people the earth and perpetuate the facts of this history in monuments and traditions.

"All those nations among whom have prevailed various forms of polytheism and pantheism give strong evidence in their early history of a faith strictly monotheistic. The leading minds of all polytheistic nations have been monotheistic.

"The history of the religious thought of mankind, it is true, has not been in all respects progressive. Starting from monotheism, the tendencies have been polytheistic

and pantheistic, followed by a return to monotheism in proportion to civilization, intelligence, and piety. It is singular that Darwin and Herbert Spencer have not learned that there are no movements on straight lines; all things move in curves and circles. The way out is the way back, reversed."

CHAPTER VI.

MORALITY.

"THE Bible records a progressive morality. No one can carefully study it without perceiving a progress in moral teaching, as well as a development in religious doctrine; nor can any one impartially compare the Law of Moses with the Gospel of Christ without observing a difference of moral standard in them." (P. 97.)

"But it may be asked, Is inspiration compatible with imperfect morality? Certainly it is; because, if a man honestly conforms to the highest moral standard of his time, he is a truly moral man." (P. 98.)

John Stuart Mill is said to have stated there might be a world in which two and two would make five. As yet we are not aware that any one has discovered that world. It seems to be a common thing, however, for a certain class of theologians to explain and excuse the immoralities, weaknesses and inhumanity of certain Old Testament incidents by the difference of "moral standard."

But what is a moral standard, or, as we believe, more properly, Who is the moral standard? No one, we will presume, will question when we say, God is the moral standard. This being the case, we may expect to find an embodiment of His mind concerning morality somewhere and somehow. This we find in the moral law. But before that He had said to Abraham, "*Walk before Me and be thou perfect.*"

But some may say the law was not given till Moses;

therefore, as sin is the transgression of the law, how were people to know? This raises the question of knowledge and fact. It is a fact that before Moses there was moral law; not written upon stone, but upon the fleshy tablets of the heart. This moral law was known to the federal head of the race, and ran on from them, but not of them, for God alone is law-giver, just as the instinct of the creature may be in the creature, but not of the creature. Every man born into the world, therefore, is born with a conscience that reveals to him moral law. Man knew a perfect God from the beginning; this is certainly the record of the Bible. The Decalogue was a fact, and men were not at liberty to break it any more before it was written on stone than after it was written. There were as holy men before the written law as ever after it—witness Abel, Enoch, Noah, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Joseph. God is still the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. The lives of these men, their surroundings considered, are all as sublime from a moral standpoint as any in history. By what moral standard did they live? By the same moral standard that afterwards sustained John the Baptist, Peter, John, James and Paul.

Righteousness, truth and purity have ever been the same; it could not be otherwise with a perfect God as Father of humanity. The time in which a man lives may have something to do with his appreciation of the standard of morality. He may not be able to see the whole truth any more than the Greenlander is able to see the whole sun as much as those who are farther south. Light is the same, however, in the north as in the south, and comes from the same source, though not as much of it; but the fault is not with the sun. So we believe that men are conditioned morally the same as physically. The opportunities for light are not all the same. Now, apply this spiritually, and what have we? Nothing less than the Sun of Righteousness, who has always shone upon this world, is shining to-day on all lands where humanity is,

though not with the same significance. But, to steal, commit adultery, worship false images, covet, are wrong, just as wrong in China as in England or America; but the judgment following the wrong will not be the same in both instances, as the responsibility is not the same. But this would open up a field too wide for our present purpose. At the same time, when so much is being said about "progressive morality," we do well to stop before admitting, as some would, that "the advancement and conditions of the age must make both room and demand for the revelation before it will be given." We prefer to think that the great and good God always made ample provision for His creatures, and that His revelation, given at creation to Adam, when properly used, was sufficient to develop in man the highest morality. Indeed, we question whether a higher type of morality has ever been known to the world than was manifested in such lives as stated above, all of whom undoubtedly knew but one universal righteous God, and kept also every precept, afterwards written upon the tables of stone, which was no new revelation to man, but merely a new way of stating the law for national purposes, what the people hitherto had been required to keep. This same law, afterwards called the Law of Moses, was referred to by the prophets as the standard of morality, whose burden was "back to the law" (not forward to some new moral development), as the burden of our preaching to-day is—back to Christ. Strange does it not seem that Ezekiel should refer to Noah, Daniel and Job, as having special influence because of their righteousness (Ezek. xiv. 14), who are given as prominent a place in the same connection as that which Jeremiah gives to Moses and Samuel.* Notwithstanding from Noah to Daniel there was a lapse of about 1,779 years, and each one lived in different ages, separated by hundreds of years, yet they were men specially noted for their righteousness, according to the testimony of holy

* Jer. xv. 1.

writ. We cannot, therefore, think that "morality," which according to Chancellor Burwash is "the conviction of right in the conscience," is progressive at all, but is one of those fundamental "convictions" that runs parallel with the race. There are as bad men in the world to-day in every community, notwithstanding the light they have, as there were before the Flood.

If men, by the wilful desire, disregard these first principles, and this disregard is transmitted from generation to generation, until a wholly different state of things appears, the fault is not in the revelation, but in the subjects of the revelation, whose sins are visited upon the third and fourth generation, who must *get back* to the first principles, and not wait for a different kind of morality than what has been common to all who have been witnesses of God in every age of the world.

The names by which God chose to reveal Himself to His ancient people were Elohim, Eloah, Jehovah, Adoni. The most frequently used terms, however, are Elohim and Jehovah, translated in our Bibles as "God" and "Lord." The name God is common to thirty-seven books of the Old Testament; and that of Lord quite common to thirty-six of these books. His attributes, such as *chesed*, *chanan*, translated "mercy" (which may also mean kindness), run through the Scriptures from Genesis to Zechariah; *ahab*, "love," from Genesis to Malachi; *tob*, "goodness," from Exodus to Zechariah; *channun*, *chanan*, "graciousness," from Exodus to Malachi; *crek aph*, "long-suffering," common to Exodus, Numbers, Psalms, Jeremiah; *nasa*, *salach*, "forgiveness," common from Genesis to Isaiah, and from Exodus to Amos.

In Exodus we read that God is glorious in holiness; in Amos, that He hath sworn by His holiness. In Deuteronomy He is the *faithful* God; in Isaiah He is the Lord that is *faithful*.

We are left, therefore, to no other conclusion but that God was known from the beginning as the "Lord God,

merciful and gracious, long-suffering and abundant in goodness and truth." (Ex. xxxiv. 6, 7.) Indeed, take this passage in connection with another found in the same book (xv. 11), "Glorious in holiness, fearful in praises, doing wonders," and we have the most perfect expression of the divine attributes in the whole Bible; and this description was given by its first writer.

Surely there is no progressive morality here, so far as the standard is concerned, at least; and whatever differences there were among the nations at that time of the world's history, that standard was just the same then as now. No one would think of comparing the Turkish Empire with the British nation in morals, either public or social. Yet the light first came to that part of the world over which Turkey rules. The Fiji Islands are the most religious of all places in the world, yet they have only had about sixty years of Christianity.

CHAPTER VII.

ANTHROPOMORPHISM.

“WE are not to infer from the description that the Deity really exists in the shape of a man, or that he actually appeared to Abraham with a human body, and walked and talked and ate with the old patriarch.” (P. 122.)

When God speaks in Scripture, how are we to interpret such an exercise? What language did He use? Certainly a language understood by those whom He addressed. If He spake, why not see, hear, walk, touch, etc.? If He did not speak, then we are at a loss to understand a great deal of the Old Testament language. Moreover, if He did not speak when the writers credit Him with talking to His people, what reason have we for assuming that He heard them? If, however, He could hear the people as they prayed to Him in their own language, why could He not speak to them in their own tongue? If He did not hear, then what reason have we for believing that He hears now? Take away the fact that God spake, and you just as reasonably shut Him out from hearing also; when, lo! the institution of prayer is forever abolished.

In the incident referred to (Gen. xviii.), the narrative distinctively refers to the *Lord* appearing unto Abraham. His was no unusual occurrence, for the Lord had appeared before, and He appeared at different times afterwards. He had already appeared to Hagar (Gen. xvi.) as the angel of the Lord, speaking as only God would speak: “I will multiply thy seed exceedingly, that it shall not be numbered for multitude.” (Gen. xvi. 9.) Hagar was so impressed with the manifestation that she called the name of the Lord

that spake unto her : "Thou God seest me." (Gen. xvi. 13.) This same Lord appears to Lot (Gen. xviii. 33), Jacob (Gen. xxviii. 31, 32), Moses (Exod. iii.), Manoaah and Jephthah (Judges xiii.). He says to Moses (Exod. iii. 6): "I am the God of thy father, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob." The term used in the second verse is "angel of the Lord"; in fourth verse, "the Lord"; in sixth verse, "God." Each of the references declares him who appeared to be "Jehovah," as both His Omniscience and Omnipotence are repeatedly shown.

After these incidents, then, are we to suppose that God did not appear; that He was not a guest of Abraham; that He did not rain fire from heaven upon Sodom; that He did not appear to Jacob as he dreamed; that Moses heard no voice from the burning bush; and that the parents of Samson were not conscious of the presence of God? Take away the appearances of God, His speaking and hearing, from these incidents, and you take away a good deal from the Bible. You take away everything surrounding these incidents, the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah, Lot's flight, the burning bush and Moses' commission, the history of Samson, etc. Do that and you discredit Genesis, Exodus, and Judges. Discredit these books and you discredit all, according to the same analogy. If the speaking and hearing and seeing of God on these occasions were all symbolical, why may such not be the case throughout the whole Bible where the appearance of God is recorded? For ourselves, the appearances of God, just as the narrative declares them, and the incidents in connection with such appearances, stand or fall together. If God sees and hears to-day, as we believe He does, what was to hinder Him from doing the same 6000 years ago?

One instance we have not as yet adduced, because of its liability to be misunderstood in connection with the others, namely, the appearance of the captain of the Lord's host to Joshua. (Joshua v. 13.) "Some say a created angel in human form appeared, but the ancient Jewish Church and the majority of the Christian Fathers agree in the

belief that it was the second person of the ever-blessed Trinity, the Word—He who said, ‘No man hath seen God (the Father) at any time. The Only Begotten, who is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him.’ This view is confirmed by the command to Joshua (verse 15 and by vi. 2), where the person who here appeared to him is called Jehovah, and issues his commands with authority. . . . Clearly, therefore, this was not a dream nor vision.”

The above is the comment of John Lloyd, M.A., F.R.H.S., author of “Analysis of Hebrew Text of Genesis i.-xi.,” “Analysis of Hebrew Text of Ecclesiastes.” His comment, therefore, on this incident makes all the other incidents stronger. So here at least is one “modern scholar” whose commentary on Joshua is a text-book for students, and who believes that God could speak, see and be seen in the manifestation that He chose to appear in.

The remarks of Dr. W. B. Pope, the eminent theologian, may be of interest here also : “In the earlier books of the Bible, the appearances of God or Jehovah, the theophanies, as they were called, were sometimes in the form of angels or men. Moses spake to Jehovah *face to face*. In the plains of Mamre three men appeared to Abram, while one Lord spake to him ; but one Angel, and one Man, is pre-eminent. Of him, Jehovah said, “*My name is in him.*” It was the *Angel of Jehovah* who gave Abraham the first promise, swearing “*by Myself.*” With him Jacob wrestled, and Hosea says that this being was *even Jehovah, God of hosts.*

The position of these well-known authors referred to in this chapter is decidedly against the position taken by Dr. Workman, whose methods of interpretation, if adopted by many (which we are far from believing is the case to-day), would be very disastrous to faith in the “foundations of belief.”

From the foregoing it will be seen that our contention is not that God necessarily exists in “form as a man,” but that whenever it suited His purpose He appeared just in the way the Scriptures declare He did.

CHAPTER VIII.

INSPIRATION.

“THE spiritualizing of Scripture for the sake of obtaining a Christian meaning, or with a view of solving a moral difficulty, is as unscientific as it is unauthorized.” (P. 56.)

He thus misconstrues the plain, symbolical language of Scripture to be met with everywhere. Dr. Workman is surely not going to fasten upon us the shackles of mediævalism when every portion of Scripture was literalized, appearing afterwards in the Church as dogmas, however astonishing they might be. This method of interpretation would lead us to accept a great many of the errors of the Romish Church, such as substantiation, auricular confession, and the worship of the host. We must certainly spiritualize a great many of Christ's sayings, otherwise they are most unintelligible. In fact, we can scarcely account for such an expression on Dr. Workman's part when this is the very thing he has done himself, and is striving to do throughout his whole book, at least so it appears to us.

What strange reading, amounting, indeed, to a contradiction, in which Dr. Workman apparently opposes himself. For on page 25 we read, “Hence, in primitive times, no doubt, some features of the story were regarded as literal facts which, at the present time, are not so regarded; but the structure of the narrative indicates that the inspired writer purposely clothed his description of the Garden, as well as his account of the Fall, in somewhat symbolic language.

"This latter portion of Scripture is an allegorical or a parabolical representation of the beginning of moral evil in human nature. As 'a sublime allegory of the birth of conscience,' it describes what happens in the experience of men to-day as truly as it describes what happened in man's experience at the dawn of history. . . . Inasmuch as the doctrine of a *personal devil* does not belong to Mosaism, and does not appear in the Old Testament before the time of the Exile, the best interpreters of Genesis do not hold that the story of the Fall teaches the primeval personality of Evil." (Pages 25, 26.)

Here Dr. Workman uses the "unscientific" and "unauthorized" method of interpretation so much that he gets rid of a personal devil, the literal story of the Fall, and consequently destroys the very structure of the Old Testament by taking away its foundation chapters—in other words, by spiritualizing them into a meaning that very few writers hold, and these by no means necessarily regarded as the only scholars of the day. Let Dr. Workman be assured that nine out of every ten of the seats of learning on this continent are opposed to his interpretation—seats of learning that for breadth of scholarship and accuracy of knowledge are in no way inferior to the "scholars" so often quoted by him. Certain it is that the whole body of Methodist ministers and teachers, with a very few exceptions, are decidedly opposed to spiriting away the story of the Fall. It certainly seems unaccountable how Dr. Workman can use the very method that he opposes in others. For let Dr. Workman cease to employ the method which he describes as "unscientific" and "unauthorized," and all the novelty of his book disappears. It may, however, be instructive to Dr. Workman to know that Dr. Sayce, the eminent Assyriologist, whom he sometimes quotes, does not agree with him so far as the Fall of Man and the site of Paradise are concerned. There is nothing in the writings of that eminent scholar to indicate that the first few chapters of Genesis are an allegory. He

treats the narrative as literal history. His words are : "The garden which God planted was in Eden, and Eden, as we learn from the Cuneiform records, was the ancient name of the field or the plain of Babylonia, when the first living creatures had been created. . . . The rivers of Eden can be found in the rivers and canals of Babylonia." * There is no allegory here.

"It is as unwarrantable for men to claim that his (Christ's) reference to the story of Jonah proves that the incident is historical, or that he believed it to be historical." (P. 60.)

"In claiming that the story of Jonah is not literal but *tropical* history, Christian scholars do not deny that Jonah was a real personage, or that the outlines of the narrative rest upon a basis of fact." (P. 61.) He thus makes figurative what is literal, and therefore impugns the wisdom of Christ and His Apostles, besides leaving it to human reason to say what are and what are not the inspired facts of Scripture. He therefore makes it difficult for the student of Scripture to understand what are the plain narratives of fact.

With reference to the above stricture on the Book of Jonah, we are perfectly safe in saying that Christian scholars do not all regard the book as *tropical*; the weight of evidence seems to be on the other side. They further consider such methods as those followed by Dr. Workman and a few others not enough to materially alter the case in any way, scarcely enough to create a sensation, and a long way from being enough, either by their scholarship or reputation, to affect the current of thought, which, after all, is growing stronger in the direction of the supernatural in the Bible and the literalness of such books as Jonah. In every "Teacher's Bible" published by the representative "Bible houses" Jonah is declared to be a literal and not a "*tropical*" book. The Bible publishing house is not in existence yet, so far as we know, that would

* "Fresh Light from the Ancient Monuments," pp. 25, 26.

publish in its aids to teachers anything else. This is significant, as they certainly supply these aids through the most distinguished scholars.

As against Dr. Workman, we may be permitted to quote Professor Robertson, D.D., of Glasgow University, who says : "The form of the book is thus historical, and, if we omit the second chapter, the whole reads continuously." The view held by Dr. Workman he calls a "supposition."

Jamieson, Faussett and Brown, in their Commentary, remark : "The book is prose narrative throughout, except the prayer of thanksgiving in chapter ii."

"The Chaldaisms in the original do not prove spuriousness or a later age, but were natural in the language of one living in Zebulun, on the borders of the north, whence Aramic peculiarities would readily arise ; moreover, his message to Nineveh implies acquaintance with Assyrian. Indeed, none but Jonah could have written or dictated so peculiar details, known only to himself." At the expense of being pitied for lack of a due appreciation of the situation, we will quote another "Christian scholar." Dr. Pierson says, in his "Key to the Word": "To refine away from this story the supernatural element destroys the product as an inspired book. It has been treated as a dream, fiction, fable, parable, apologue, allegory. Jonah has been conceded to be an historical personage treated in a symbolical character. . . . But such interpretations make havoc not only of the inspiration of the Word, but of the divinity of our Lord, who treated this as a veritable narrative. (Matt. xii. 39-41.)" Dr. Pusey, in his "Commentary on Nahum," says: "The prophecy of Nahum is both the complement and the counterpart of the Book of Jonah." That the Book of Jonah is veritable history is what fourteen millions of teachers and scholars have *been made* to believe through the International Series of Lessons. Only occasionally do we hear of the pulpit changing over to the modern view held by a few scholars, while for the pulpit it can be said that, as a rule, it invites the freest criticism.

Learned scholars there are who symbolize this book ; learned men there are who see in it only an allegory, with a meagre historical basis ; learned men there are who see no historic basis at all for the book, which we claim affects other books, and also undervalues the historic narrative of the Christ. On the other hand, there are many learned men who do not accept the Bible at all. The weight of sanctified scholarship, with conscience as well as mind, with heart as well as theory, with scholarship guided by the Holy Ghost more than by the unspiritual rationalism of some foreign universities, still is with the old interpretation. The theories of the scholars are mostly mere statements based on facts introduced into their minds from doubtful sources. Take the supernatural out of the Book of Jonah, divest it of its historic character, make the references of Christ in such a sacred relation a mere accommodation for the time,—do this with the Book of Jonah and by the same process every miracle performed by Christ can be undervalued. The question is not—Can we see the reason of things, can we fathom them by our logic, or explain them by rhetoric ? Long ago it was stated that “ His ways are past finding out.” There are things for faith as well as reason ; for by faith we believe that the worlds were made by the Word of God. If faith subdued kingdoms, wrought righteousness, obtained promises, stopped the mouths of lions, quenched the violence of fire, escaped the edge of the sword, etc., what was there in the way of faith acting for Jonah, who was servant of a God with whom all things were possible ? Believing in an omnipotent God, there is nothing incredible in the fish story of the Book of Jonah, and any writer does violence to the truth who dismisses in a few sentences the real character of one of the most beautiful histories of God’s Word.

Another phase of this question leads us to what we think more serious considerations, namely, Where are we going to stop ? If we can take out at will the historic references

of Christ ; if Jonah is a myth, what about Moses, Daniel, Isaiah, David, Noah, Abraham, Elijah and Elisha ? Disprove Jonah, and how can you prove the others were real persons to Christ's mind ? If no fish swallowed Jonah, if the incident is purely mythical, notwithstanding Christ's assertion to the contrary, what about the serpent in the wilderness, which was lifted up by Moses (Num. xxi. 9), the Queen of the South (1 Kings x. 1), the blood of Zechariah (2 Chron. xxiv. 20), the blood of Abel (Gen. iv. 8), the cleansed Naaman (2 Kings v. 14), Lot and Sodom (Gen. xix. 16), Lot's wife (Gen. xxvi.), the creation of male and female (Gen. i. 27) ? Jesus referred to all of these as real historic verities, but not more so than to Jonah. The following apt illustration by the Rev. Francis J. Sharr, the Fernley Lecturer for 1891, is to the point here :

“ ‘For example, does His—*i.e.*, our Lord's—use of Jonah's resurrection as a type of His own depend in any real degree upon whether it is historical fact or allegory ?’ In plain English, was it quite honest on the part of our Lord, knowing, as He did, that Jonah was a myth, to refer to his preaching to the Ninevites, and to his being in the belly of the fish, and to use these as illustrations and arguments ? Let us suppose a case. Here is a gentleman wishful to enter Parliament, and he becomes a candidate with a view to represent a certain district. He has a meeting of the electors, and pledges himself, if they will only send him, that he will at once remove some of those anomalies of which there are loud complaints. He pledges himself to do his best to abolish those pensions paid for doing the duties of offices that have long become extinct, and which hitherto no Government has honestly attempted to deal with. ‘Send me,’ he urges, ‘and I give you a solemn promise that as Hercules cleansed the Augean stables, so I will sweep away these abuses.’ They send him. Twelve months pass away, and his voice is not heard in the House at all. At the end of this period he appears before his constituents. They reproach him for breach of faith. ‘I beg

you to recall my words,' he says. 'I promised you that just as Hercules performed a certain feat of labor, so I would set myself to accomplish a certain task. Now, Hercules was a myth. He never existed, and, therefore, of course, never performed what he was said to perform; and I have kept my word to you by doing as he did—that is, never doing it at all.' Now, would not these electors feel they were duped? Would they not say, 'Though in a sense he had kept his promise to their ear, he had broken it to their hope'? Would such conduct as that appear honest and honorable? If Jonah was a myth in allegory; . . . if the narrative of Jonah being three days and three nights in the whale's belly was all a fable, what proof could it be of the resurrection? Again, if Jonah was a myth, so, of course, was his mission to Nineveh, and by treating history to that sort, we might reduce it all to myth and fable."

"None of the historians of the Bible claims exceptional enlightenment in regard either to the collection of facts or to the narration of events." (P. 68.) He thus makes the Bible, like any other book, to depend on knowledge and circumstances for accuracy; for, says he, "They collected their facts as fully as their opportunities permitted, and reported them as accurately as their knowledge would allow." (P. 68.) This, to say the least, is forcing out the supernatural with considerable candor. Upon such a statement, then what have we! A purely human book, full of error; a fallible record scarcely worthy of our respect. They have not given us any more accurate an account of the Creation, the Patriarchs, the Flood, the Judges, the Kings, the surrounding nations, than can be found on the monuments or the tablets, the remnants of ancient writers, or any and all other writers who wrote from party, national, or ecclesiastical standpoints. If we are to meet with fraud and error and misstatement anywhere, we must expect some in the Bible also. The writers are not to blame; they did the best they could under the circumstances, but

they didn't know, and, therefore, what could be expected? On the other hand, every scrawl met with on the pillars of heathen temples, every notice and scratch on the monuments, everything in the form of writing found anywhere on the wide wastes of ancient times, must be taken to be absolutely true. No errors can be found on the stone book, whether written by paid scribe, sycophantic priest, cringing courtier, egotistic monarch, unscrupulous time-server, hated partisan, or ignorant idolater. Who wrote these things on the monuments? we would like to ask. Since they have become the instructors of "Christian scholars," what were their lives, their position, their belief, that we should place so much credence in what is found written by them? Did they always stick to facts? Have we any way of judging that they did? Were they always scrupulous in their statements? Or, were not some of them like the reporters at the seat of the late Turkish war, who reported often according to their instructions, and not according to their knowledge? Human nature was at the time the inscriptions were made, about which so much is being said, just as strange a thing as it is to-day; certainly no better, if history means anything where those monuments are found.

But supposing everything to have been discovered to be true, every inscription a correct summary of facts as far as the knowledge of the writers went, must we judge God's records by them? Yea, rather let God be true, let His Word be correct, and let it be the standard of truth, and let all other records be measured by it. But if, as is implied by Dr. Workman, the Bible is the best that could be done with the material that its historians had to work upon, what a mistake has been made! Why not have kept the revelation back until now, when more opportunities would have been given for accuracy? For what is wanted now is not a revision, but a new Bible; yea, it would seem that in the closing days of this century this were desired by some. The Book which our fathers have believed and

taught to their children ; that awoke the slumbering nations of Europe ; that, like a mighty search-light, cut its way into the darkness of England in the twelfth century ; that heralded the mighty revivals of the eighteenth century ; that rested as the corner-stone of the constitutional liberty of the greatest republic of all time ; that has always been more in itself than has ever been claimed for it by its most ardent disciples—this Word of God must be changed ! It is too big ; it is not God's Word ; it is man's, compiled by man, whose errors are being discovered now, and therefore must always have been erroneous—book after book of the blessed Word being discredited, page after page torn out, historic portion after historic portion made into allegory, or symbol, or myth !

No Adam, no Fall, no Paradise, no Flood, no Jonah, no Job, no Daniel, no Moses for the Pentateuch ! Going, going ! How much further will they try to bring discredit upon the Word ? What is their aim ? Who are these Christian scholars ? Where did they spring from ? They represent the rationalistic school of biblical interpretation—a school, by the way, that seems to have a special fitness for making the Bible to abound in mistakes and contradictions. Now, while no one thinks that the same supernatural intervention was needed for the narrative parts of Scripture as was necessary for the revelation of truth and prophecy, at the same time inspiration was needed for the narrative that the writers might know what to put in and what to leave out, which is an entirely different thing to saying that they reported things as accurately as their knowledge would allow. The same spirit that revealed the truth also was present to arrange the facts and events that make up the narratives giving us the histories of a Joseph, a Ruth, a David, and not some other persons who lived at the same time. The very harmony of the biblical narrative, to our mind, is a proof of its inspiration, for nothing like it exists in all the annals of literature. In this respect the Scriptures are divinely one.

Then I do not believe that the above statement of Dr. Workman is a correct statement. *The men of the Bible did claim exceptional enlightenment.* (This includes historians and others.) A contradiction here is all that is necessary. Let the writers themselves state the case. David said: "The spirit of the Lord spake by me, and his word was in my tongue." (2 Sam. xxiii. 1.) Jeremiah says (i. 9): "The Lord put forth his hand and touched my mouth. And the Lord said unto me, Behold I have put my words in thy mouth." (xxxvi. 1, 2.) This word came unto Jeremiah from the Lord saying: "Take thee a roll of a book, and write therein all the words that I have spoken unto thee against Israel," etc. Paul, "Which things also we speak, not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth, comparing spiritual things with spiritual. I certify you, brethren, that the gospel which was preached of me is not after man. For I neither received it of man, neither was I taught it, but by revelation of Jesus Christ." (1 Cor. ii. 12; Gal. i. 11, 12.)

Moses constantly reiterates: "And the Lord spake unto Moses." Also in Joshua, "The Lord spake unto Joshua." Isaiah writes according to the "Vision" and the "Word." Jeremiah, "The word of the Lord came to me." Ezekiel says: "The heavens were opened and I saw visions of God;" also repeatedly, "The word of the Lord came unto me." The prophets generally speak as the Lord directed them.

The following quotations from Dr. Pope and Professor Finney speak for themselves. They, at least, took exactly the opposite view to that of Dr. Workman, which, to our mind, is quite unscriptural:

"Do the writers of the New Testament manifest any consciousness of this inspiration?

"They show it precisely as the *ancient writers* showed it: by the assertion of an authority in their words not otherwise to be understood; by hints here and there which are full of significance; and by the uniform majesty of the whole.

"Give instances in illustration of this.

"St. Luke records the promise of oral inspiration : The Holy Spirit shall teach you in that very hour what ye ought to say. (Luke xii. 12.) Compare this with his discourses of St. Peter, St. Stephen and St. Paul in the Acts. St. Peter speaks of the new revelation as making the old *more sure* ; as containing the commandment of the Lord and Saviour through your apostles (2 Pet. i. 19 ; iii. 2, 16) ; one of whom, St. Paul, approved the wisdom given him *in all his epistles*, which are classed with *the other Scriptures*. St. John closes the New Testament by two notes : *I was in the Spirit*, the same John *who bare witness*, and was commanded, *Write therefore* ; and remembering the Lord's promise fulfilled in himself, gave the important testimony, It is the Spirit that beareth witness, because the Spirit is the truth. (Rev. i. 10 ; ii. 19 ; 1 John v. 7.)

"THE INSPIRING SPIRIT AND THE INSPIRED WRITERS.

"1. What is here the specific office of the Holy Spirit ?

"(1) In the unity and intercommunion of the Holy Trinity God is the inspirer : Every scripture inspired of God. Men spake from God, though being moved by the Holy Ghost. All the acts and offices of the Three Persons severally are the acts and offices of the one God. (2 Tim. iii. 16 ; 2 Pet. i. 21.)

"(2) The Son is the source and sphere of all revelation ; and still the Spirit of Christ was in the ancient prophets and is the Spirit of truth in the apostles. (1 Pet. i. 11 ; John xvi. 13.)

"(3) Hence, as the administrator of redemption in all ages, the Holy Spirit is the organ of Divine communications and the inspirer of the writers or the writings that record them.

"2. How does the New Testament speak of the Spirit's inspiration in the Old ?

"In a style which assumes that He both speaks and writes in the ancient oracles.

"(1) Our Lord's solitary testimony to the speaking is, How then doth David in the Spirit call Him Lord? (Matt. xxii. 43 ; John x. 35.) But we must connect with this, The Scripture cannot be broken, every voice and ever Scripture shares the prerogative of inviolability with this voice and this particular Scripture."

Dr. Finney says :

"The writers of the New Testament unqualifiedly assert their own inspiration, and God confirms their testimony by miracles. (Gal. i. 11, 12 ; 1 Cor. ii. 10, 12, 13 ; xiv. 37 ; 2 Cor. ii. 17 ; 1 Thess. ii. 13 ; iv. 8 ; 1 John iv. 6.)

"The writers of the New Testament put their own writings upon a level with those of the prophets and Old Testament writers. (Eph. ii. 20 ; 2 Peter iii. 15, 16.)

"It has been generally admitted, that the oral instructions of the Apostles were inspired. But they considered their writings of the same authority with their oral instructions. (John xx. 31 ; 1 John i. 1-4 ; 2 Thess. ii. 15 ; 1 Cor. xv. 1 ; Eph. iii. 3 ; Acts xv. 28.)

"They consider their own writings as of such high authority that an unqualified reception of them and obedience to them is everywhere made by them an indispensable condition of salvation.

"The belief that the Old Testament was given by inspiration of God was universal among the Jews, and Christ and his Apostles invariably confirm this opinion. (Luke xxiv. 27, 44 ; 2 Peter i. 21 ; 2 Tim. iii. 16.)

"They speak of the Old Testament as the Word of God. This is so common with them that I need not cite instances.

"The Old Testament writings are called the commandments, testimonies and ordinances of the Lord.

"Every act of obedience or disobedience to the Old Testament writers is considered by Christ and the Apostles as obedience or disobedience to God.

"There is not an instance in which Christ or the Apostles intimate that a single sentence of the Old Testament is either spurious or uninspired.

"This is incredible if both Christ and his Apostles did not regard the Old Testament as given by the inspiration of God."

Then what are we to make of the oft-repeated phrase, "The Lord said unto Moses," if the "historical writers claim no exceptional enlightenment"? If the phrase means anything, it means that Moses claims to have been in direct correspondence with God when he declared himself to the people, stating things, indeed, which were afterwards written under his direction and supervision, if not by himself.

CHAPTER IX.

CITATION.

BEFORE referring to the statements of our author here, I would like to notice what is a perfectly clear matter of history, namely, that the Old Testament which we use to-day is substantially the same as that which Jesus Himself used. Indeed, it is conceded on the highest authority that the very books which we regard as belonging to the Old Testament were every one of them in use at least one hundred years before Christ. There are some writers, and with good reason, who find no difficulty in tracing the Old Testament, substantially as we have it to-day, back to the time of Ezra. We will not stop to make good that claim, as it is sufficient for our purpose to know that the book which we teach to our children was taught to Jesus when He was a child, and taught by Him to the multitudes. He does not quote from every book, but from the majority of them, and never once does He challenge their authenticity. That He was versed in the Scriptures all will certainly admit. He was taught them, and He not only knew them, but He knew them the best of any one in the world. No one will ever know them as well, nor will any one make as good use of them as He, not only because He spake as never man spake, but He knew they testified of Him, and was, therefore, prepared to state what portions were fulfilled in Him. He sacredly guarded the Scriptures (the many books), as also the Scripture, the one book containing the whole. Had any of the books which He quoted been

spurious He would not have been slow to declare them as such. How different was His attitude to the Old Testament to that which He sustained to the Church of His day! The Church had been in existence before Him, but how He challenged its spirit and purpose, how He laid bare their false pretensions is plain in His many contacts with the scribes and Pharisees. Jesus loved the truth and fulfilled it. The Pharisees revered the law, but made it void by their traditions. Yet we are informed by Josephus, supposed to be the greatest Hebrew of his day outside of Christianity, that so sacredly did his people treasure the Scriptures, the very same indeed that we have, that they would endure the rack, and even death, rather than give them up, or allow them to be taken from them. Josephus, beyond doubt, had a better opportunity of knowing what were the books of the Old Testament than the most learned of the critics of to-day. He regarded, for instance, such a book as Jonah as real history. (See his "Antiquities," Book 9, chapter 10, section 2.)

Here, then, we have, on the one hand, a Jewish critic and historian quoting as real history the same portion to which Jesus referred; and on the other hand, while no opinion is expressed by the Master as to the literary quality of His quotation, yet He who knew all things, being familiar with the literature of His day, and, therefore, knowing how the Jews must have regarded their own literature, makes use of an incident in their history which must have been familiar to them all. Had He used it in any other way than as an historic reference it is likely He would have been challenged. In dealing, therefore, with the citations of Jesus, it must be assumed that in no way would He mislead the people, nor would He use as history anything that was not founded on fact.

"Christ's utterance in the New Testament regarding any Old Testament book does not raise, much less decide, the question either of its age, or of its authorship, or of its literary character." (P. 63.) Dr. Workman will, no doubt,

admit that at least Jesus knew the books of the Old Testament, that He quoted very often from these books, that He believed them to have special reference to Himself, and as such He applied them.

He is at the head of a class of students among whom are Peter, James and John. They have read the Old Testament also. They are acquainted with the prophets. The names of Moses, David and Isaiah are familiar to them. When Jesus speaks of them they recall their own knowledge of the same. They are accustomed to believe His words. He is to establish the great fact of history—His own life among men. Is it thinkable that He would deal with mythical and legendary matter, that He would pass off as history to His disciples what had no existence in fact, or that He did not know what He was doing when He quoted from the Old Testament writers? "They testify of me," He said. Therefore, when He spake of Moses, He meant Moses; of Jonah, He meant Jonah; of Isaiah, He meant Isaiah. The very fact that He quoted them was proof of their existence. He called the books after their names, not only as they were understood, but He understood them to be as they were quoted by Him. He knew one Moses, one David, one Isaiah, not a multiplicity of these persons. The argument is sometimes used that in quoting from Wesley's hymns we employ the same method as Christ employed, as the Methodist Hymn-book is one, while the authors are many. But we know the authors, and their names are appended to the hymns, and any one who would quote Newman for Toplady, or Wesley for Watts, would be regarded as very inaccurate in statement. No one with any literary taste at all would care to do such a thing. Yet if one whom we knew to be well versed in hymnology were to quote from the Methodist Hymn-book, and say that Wesley, or Watts, or Charles Wesley wrote so and so, we would be apt to accept his statement as being correct; though if he should make an error it would only prove he was human. But Jesus was divine; all

knowledge belonged to Him. He knew what was in men. He could tell the reasoning in their hearts. He knew their thoughts afar off. Nathaniel, Judas, Peter, the woman of Samaria, were all known to Him before He made Himself known to them; and so were the books of the Old Testament, so were their authors. Hence, the very fact of His citing them is proof of their genuineness, and such has been the opinion of the Church since the days of His actual citations.

The citations of Jesus certainly raise the question of the value of the citation in point; next, what is the import of the citation? The value of the citation is seen in the fact, that while Jesus was among men at the time He used the Old Testament Scriptures, He had been thought of by others, hundreds of years before, who wrote of Him, "For before Abraham was I am."

There is more authority in the simple citation, "It is written," when used by Jesus, than in a whole library of adverse criticisms. Note how He questions: "How readest thou?" "What is written in your law?" "Have ye not read?" "Have ye not read that which was spoken to you by God?" "Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law till all be fulfilled." We therefore still incline to the opinion that "our Lord's witness to the inspiration of both Testaments is to those who believe in Him the sum of all evidence. As the Son of God incarnate He re-utters the entire Old Testament as *His own ancient oracles made new*. They died in Him to their transitory meaning, and rose with Him to the power of an endless life."

CHAPTER X.

EVOLUTION.

"God is represented first as a creative Being, next as an almighty Being, next as a self-existent Being, then as a holy Being, and afterwards as an absolute Being. The attribute of omnipotence does not appear in Scripture till the age of the patriarchs ; self-existence, till Moses ; holiness, till the theocracy ; omnipresence, till canonical prophets." (P. 48.)

He thus disparages the revelation of God to His people of Himself, and explains the moral development of the race by the principles of evolution. By accepting the theory of evolution the author assumes what is contrary to the teaching of Scripture, and also what science has never been able to demonstrate. This unproved theory, we believe, lies at the very foundation of the methods used by the higher critic ; in fact, radical criticism and evolution go hand in hand, which, when adopted, lead to fanciful theories of interpretation, instead of sound reasoning according to facts. It leads also to the rejection of faith, which always must underlie our interpretation of the Scriptures.

The first great triumph of faith, as recorded by the writer of the Hebrews, is a belief "that the worlds were framed by the Word of God, so that things which are seen were not made of things which do appear." We are quite aware that the original reads somewhat differently, but not sufficiently so in any way to alter the sense. Faith therefore asserts itself by accepting the dictum of

revelation as against the unaided voice of reason, which in this place utterly fails to give an explanation of any theory of creation except that which is based on divine revelation, which faith accepts.

Accepting, then, that God is Creator, does it not follow that He is omnipotent and self-existent? Where, then, is the force of saying that the attribute of omnipotence does not appear till the patriarchs, and of self-existence till Moses? These are implied in the very first words of the Bible, "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth." Instead of indicating God the Creator (by Gen. i. 1), God the Self-existent (Exod. iii. 14), and God the Almighty (Gen. xvii. 1), the author could have stated with equal propriety that Gen. i. 1 proclaims all three. In fact, we are but stating what is implied, when we say that every natural attribute of God is implied in that one verse; for in that one passage the eternity, spirituality, unchangeableness, omnipotence, omniscience and omnipresence are all proclaimed. The Eternal God alone could be in the beginning; none but the spiritual could be before all things. The Omnipotent alone could create; the Unchangeable alone could govern the changing worlds; Omniscience was there in thought, and Omnipresence saw the first gleam of light upon this globe, and watched also the burning suns of a million worlds, for He created the heavens. If we fail to give an explanation of the origin of things, we can at least give a glorious statement as a matter of belief, which is so far beyond any explanation ever attempted by the evolutionist that we prefer rather to stand in the clear sunlight of faith than to stumble in the night-gloom of evolution.

The history of the evolution theory is really the history of an attempt to explain the unexplainable. Not so the "Mosaic Cosmogony," "which has taken a very decided position and is ante-evolutionary throughout the whole range of animal and vegetable organisms. Whether the record speaks of the origin of herb or tree, of fowl or

creeping thing, of cattle or beast of the earth, it is careful to state that each was made 'after its kind.' As if forecasting the antagonism of our modern evolutionists, this ante-evolutionary phrase is repeated again and again, so as to bring the doctrine of a direct creative origin into special prominence, and proclaim it with special emphasis."

"Men talk loosely about evolution as a thing of everyday occurrence, and adduce as an instance the evolution of the chick from the egg. This, however, is not what theoretic evolutionists mean by evolution. Their doctrine is that the higher organic forms have been evolved from lower forms, the great pioneer of theory recognizing the intervention of the Creator at the outset in the creation of certain primordial forms. In support of this theory we are referred by its advocates to the varieties which have come forth under the manipulation of pigeon fanciers and cattle breeders, to the phenomena of embryology, to certain abnormal modifications of particular forms in which nature has seemed to move *per saltum* (by a leap), and to the testimony to a progression from lower to higher forms furnished by the fossil remains of extinct species."

But (first) "nothing beyond a variety of the same species has ever been produced; and (second) that when the hand of man is withdrawn, Nature asserts itself and testifies to the truth of the Mosaic doctrine by obliterating every trace of what, through his agency has been wrought, and by restoring the variety to the original specific type."*

Evolution is, therefore, not the last word which science has to pronounce. Even provided the theory be correct, what then? What shall the future of the race be? The evolutionist has no right to stop at man, not even at Christ, as He appeared on earth, for who can tell (according to the evolution hypothesis) but that when men become a thousand times, and if a thousand why not a million times, more developed than they are now, the conception of

*Dr. Robert Watts, "Reign of Causality."

the Christ of the Gospels will not suit them? Indeed, He does not suit some already. To them He is a man that made mistakes, one that assumed many things, an idealist. Sorry comfort this to the Christian, poor food for humanity, yet such theories are being combated to-day. (See Ullmann on the "Sinlessness of Christ," Schaff on the "Person of Christ," and Steinmeyer on the "Passion and Resurrection History.")

Sometimes we hear from the pulpit that it does not matter how man came so long as he did come; the manner of his coming is of no consequence; there is just as much omnipotence displayed in growing a few primordial germs, a start in world-making, as in taking the Mosaic account of creation as a standard.

Yes, but it makes a great deal of difference when God says that there are special creations of kinds, and when man says there is only one creation of all kinds. For ourselves in no way can we reconcile the evolution theory with the Scriptures, and we lay at the door of the evolutionists the mischief that has been wrought in biblical teaching and interpretation,—for the evolution theory is still not proven.

"We may safely assume the same sort of evolution for the ages before the Scriptures were produced, namely, a gradual ascent from fetichism and polytheism to the worship of a single God." (P. 48.)

Here, we believe, as stated above, is the secret of the entire fabric of "Higher Criticism." The higher critics are evolutionists; many of them hold to the Darwinian theory, which has never been accepted by the leaders of thought in the churches and in the scientific world. The theory is not as popular to-day in the universities of the old land as it was twenty-five years ago. Evolution, as taught by Darwin, is an assumption; neither science nor revelation has noted the gradual evolution of man. He was not evolved, he was created. This is the biblical fact; this fact has never been disproved, and it

never will be. The first man, Adam, was created in the image of God. This God he knew ; he knew no other God. It was only after man had descended from the high plane on which he was created that he became an idolater or polytheist.

Just think of it, a Methodist minister—for Dr. Workman is still such—seemingly coinciding with Spencer's view of the development of the "religious idea," and the book containing such a coincidence endorsed by Chancellor Burwash ! for "whatever Mr. Spencer's personal views may be, the doctrine of his books is fatalism, materialism, atheism. These words are not used as terms of opprobrium at all, but as exactly descriptive of the system : There is no personal God. There is no immortal soul. There is nothing but necessity without and necessity within." *

It must surely be startling to a Christian public to hear from the Principal of the Wesleyan Theological College, Montreal, that Dr. Workman seems to coincide with the arch-agnostic, Herbert Spencer, on the origin of the religious idea.

"I claim more. I claim that while, in the realm of science, evolution is an unproved theory, in the realms of literature and history it is demonstrably false. It is not true that the earliest literature of a nation is the crudest, and its latest the best. It is not true that the line is one of steady improvement. This is not true of Greece, or Rome, or Germany, or France, or England, or the United States. Shakespeare and Milton have not been eclipsed. Socrates, Plato and Aristotle are still unrivalled. Madison and Jefferson were not pigmies compared to our present statesmen. Washington is still without a peer. We are not more skilful builders than the men who reared the pyramids ; nor are we greater architects than the men who designed and superintended the cathedrals. We have not eclipsed the old masters in painting, sculpture and music.

* B. P. Browne, in "The Philosophy of Herbert Spencer," p. 23.

Civilizations do not necessarily grow better as they grow older. Turkey, India and China prove the reverse. They have been going down. The machines are everywhere and always against righteousness and improvement. Progress is not due to them, but to the men who break away from them." (Dr. A. J. F. Behrends.)

"Seeing that the first chapter of Genesis teaches neither geology nor chronology, there is nothing in it inconsistent with the doctrine of evolution." (P. 85.)

We will allow two names, eminent in the department of science, to conclude this review, as their words very appropriately come in here.

GENESIS AND MODERN SCIENCE.

"On the one hand there are the materialistic scientists who scoff at the idea of a supernatural inspiration of the Bible text. On the other hand there are the theologians who limit their recognition of inspiration in the Bible to its purely spiritual truths. But over against these two classes are reverend Christian scientists and reverend unscientific Christians, who believe that God revealed to the Bible writers facts as well as principles, historic as well as prophetic; and that no one who knows less than God knows will be able to show that God was mistaken in the facts which He revealed."

"In the very front rank of American scientists stands Professor James D. Dana, of Yale University. As a geologist and a naturalist he has an eminent position in the estimation of European scholars. In comment on the latest work of Professor Guyot, Professor Dana adds: 'We believe, with Professor Guyot, that science does already afford great help toward an understanding of this ancient inspired chapter (Gen. i.) on cosmogony, and that the brief review of the majestic march of events before man makes a wonderfully befitting prelude to God's message of law and love to man, constituting the Bible.' As a result of his own scientific studies, Professor Dana

affirms that the system of creation indicated in the narrative in Genesis is 'a fact that displays purpose in the author of the document, and *knowledge beyond that of ancient or any time, and philosophy more than human.*' 'Geology,' he says, 'has ascertained many details with regard to the earth's life and the upward gradations of the various tribes. But the grand fact of progress, and the general order in the succession, were first announced in the cosmogony of the Bible.'"

"Sir J. William Dawson, of Canada, is a scientist of such eminence in his immediate sphere of geology that he has but recently been chosen President of the British Association—the highest assembly of English-speaking scientists. He certainly is entitled to an intelligent opinion—as a scientist—on this subject. Referring to the first chapter of Genesis, he has said: 'The contents of this chapter, relating, as they do, to matters which preceded the advent of man, must have been just as much the result of direct inspiration as if they had contained a prophecy of the distant future.' Recognizing the fact that many features of this record were extant long before the days of Moses, he believes that its substance 'was a *revelation* to some antediluvian patriarch, perhaps to Adam himself.' It requires some temerity, not to say presumption, on the part of one who is not a master in the realm of science, to claim that the President of the British Association is talking nonsense, when he insists that no irreconcilable differences exist between Genesis and geology."

"So long, then, as such men as Dana and Dawson continue to affirm the wonderful correspondence of the two records in their principal features, and to assert the possible completion of this accord in all the features, through the progress of scientific knowledge, men who make no claim to pre-eminence either as scientists or as theologians will do well to continue to accept the Bible story of creation as a revelation from God of facts of nature, which will doubtless be fully confirmed by the intelligent study of nature.

. . . One thing is certain. It requires less credulity to accept the Bible narrative of the order of creation as, in its earliest form, a direct revelation from God, than it would to accede to the proposition that it was evolved as a fanciful myth in the brain of primitive man.”*

In two of Sir William Dawson’s latest works, “The Meeting-place of Geology and History” and “Salient Points in the Science of the Earth,” this subject is again referred to. Sir William says: “In the first place, there can now be no doubt that the order of creation as *revealed*” (the italics are ours) “to the author of the first chapter of Genesis, corresponds with the results of astronomical and geological research in a manner which cannot be accidental. This old document thus stands in the position of a prophecy which has been fulfilled in its details.”

Hear also his “Summary of Results,” beginning page 210 (“Meeting-place of Geology and Science”):

1. “We have found no link of derivation connecting man with the lower animals which preceded him. He appears before us as a new departure in creation, without any direct relation to the instinctive life of the lower animals.”

2. “If we inquire as to the nature of the interval which separates man from the lower animals, we find that it exists in the reference both to his rational and physical nature.”

3. “And even if we admit the doctrine, as yet unproved, of the derivation of one species from another in the case of the lower animals, we are unable to supply the ‘missing links’ which would be required to connect man with any group of inferior animals.”

4. “No fact of science is more certainly established than the recency of man in geological time.”

5. “It would seem, however, that the Bible history, as well as such hints as we can gather from the history of

* *Sunday School Times*, Dec. 18th, 1886.

other nations, limits us to two or three thousand years before the Deluge of Noah, while some estimates of the antiquity of man, based on physical changes or ancient history, or on philology, greatly exceed this limit."

6. "There is but one species of man, though many races and varieties."

7. "The precise locality of the origin of man can be defined on probable grounds."

8. "The traditions which ascribe human origin to a 'Mountain of the North,' refer to the second dispersion, and coincide with the Ararat of Genesis and the 'Mountain of the North,' on which the ship of Hasis-adid was supposed by the Chaldeans to have grounded."

